PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Mission Statement:

The Minneapolis Planning Department's mission is to guide city land use, planning, development, research and analysis activities (in collaboration with elected officials, City departments, residents, neighborhoods groups, developers, property and business owners, and other public/private agencies) in order to improve and preserve the natural, physical, economic, arts, cultural, historic and social environments.

Primary Businesses:

Exercise leadership in facilitating a shared vision for Minneapolis' future

Ensure compatibility with approved city's comprehensive plan, zoning code, and land subdivision heritage preservation regulations and guidelines.

Key Trends and Challenges Impacting the Department:

Managing work volume. The department has eight vacant positions and a growing workload.

Review of Comprehensive Plan by new Mayor and City Council: The comprehensive plan lays out a vision for the City's development over the next 15-20 years. The new Mayor and City Council need to affirm that vision or make appropriate changes in areas like affordable housing, sustainability and the arts agenda.

Land Use: The Planning Department has completed or is nearing completion on a number of land use studies. These studies include: the 29th Street Corridor, the Upper River Master Plan, 46th and Hiawatha Station Area, Hiawatha-Lake Station Area, Cedar-Franklin Station Areas, Windom and West Broadway. In each case, land use needs translation into appropriate zoning.

Policy Studies: The Planning Department needs to address several policy issues for consideration by the Mayor and City Council. Examples of these policy areas include: affordable housing, industrial land supply; parking in all areas of the city; spacing requirements for various uses; and an overview of how the new zoning code has worked.

Improved Approvals: The City needs to improve the handling of development approvals to ensure good front-end information as well as a speed trip through the city system.

Staff Retention: To be able to keep a competitive package to retain current employees and attract new employees.

Addressing Change: Deal with changes directed by Mayor and City Council on McKinsey and the recent Zoning Administration/Planning merger.

Key Enterprise Outcome Measures Influenced by the: Planning Department

- 1. Increase the number of mixed-use developments along commercial corridors
- 2. Increase the percentage of cases where design or development guidelines and regulatory tools are successfully followed and/or incorporated into development projects
- 3. Enhance the pedestrian orientation and character of commercial corridors
- 4. Increase number of housing units downtown
- 5. Support implementation of Hiawatha Light Rail transit plan
- 6. Decrease number of historic buildings demolished; increase percentage of development dollars spent on renovations of historic buildings

City of Minneapolis – Planning 2003 Adopted Budget

- 7. Increase number of historic buildings renovated for new uses in a timely manner; increase the number of historic buildings that are incorporated into new developments; increase the number of buildings that are designated as historic
- 8. Increase opportunities among citizens for dialogue about their expectations for Minneapolis City government
- 9. Develop and advocate City positions and policies on airport and aviation issues to appropriate agencies.
- 10. As the Part 150 Program is extended out to the 60 DNL area, work with MAC to maintain its current standards of a 5-decibel reduction of aircraft noise in each home and air-conditioning as a key component that enables residents to keep windows closed.
- 11. Work with State to develop air transport/airport utilization plan in the "post capacity" world (short-term).
- 12. Provide professional analysis & recommendation, prepare report & presentation for public hearing in 30 days (CPC, Z&P, BOA). Review & comment on consistency of reviews with the City's comprehensive plan.
- 13. Provide technical support for required environmental reviews to be completed within state & federal mandated regulations (EAWs & EISs).
- 14. Provide professional advice to Council Members on land use & development issues in a timely manner; educate the public on land use & development issues, when requested, in a timely manner.

Performance Data for Key Enterprise Outcome Measures:

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Estimated | 2003 Planned | 2003 Approved | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|--|
| # of new mixed use | | | | | | |
| developments along | | | 4 | 4 | 4 | |
| commercial corridors | | | | | | |
| Examples of key | | | | | | |
| developments along | | | | | | |
| commercial corridors where | | | 3 | 4 | 4 | |
| Planning provided | | | 3 | 4 | 4 | |
| assistance implementing | | | | | | |
| development guidelines | | | | | | |
| Examples of key projects | | | | | | |
| along corridors to enhance | | | 3 | 4 | 4 | |
| pedestrian orientation | | | | | | |
| # housing units downtown | | | 400 | 400 | 400 | |
| Special initiatives to promote | | | | | | |
| development around LRT | | | 6 | 8 | 8 | |
| stations | | | • | • | | |
| # historic buildings (historic | | | | | | |
| resources) demolished (est) | 15 | 21 | 15 | | | |
| # historic buildings | 70 | 70 | | | | |
| renovated (est) | 70 | 70 | 60 | | | |
| Examples of historic | | Village at St. | ha Tarran Casia | | | |
| buildings incorporated into | Linden Hills Library | Anthony; | Ivy Tower; Grain | | | |
| new development | • | Milwaukee Depot | Belt | | | |
| # buildings designed as | المسائد بالماد ما | 1 district & 1 | 4 -1:-4::-4 | | | |
| # buildings designated as | 3 individual | individual | 1 district | | | |
| historic | designations | designation | designation | | | |
| Examples new initiatives to | | Y | | | | |
| engage citizens in planning | | | | | | |
| issues | | | | | | |
| Special initiatives to | | | | | | |
| influence outcome measures | N/A | N/A | 2 | 3 | 3 | |
| regarding the Airport | | | | | | |
| Identify & evaluate state & | NI/A | N1/A | | | | |
| federal legislation | N/A | N/A | 4 | 6 | 6 | |
| Employment | | | | | | |
| Affordable Housing | | | | | | |
| # of households contacted | | | | | | |
| through CUE-Mpls Blooms | 1,144 | 1,955 | 2,000 | 2,200 | 2,200 | |
| Program | -, | -, | _, | _, | _, | |

Explanation of Performance Data for Key Enterprise Outcome Measures:

While the Planning Department doesn't directly provide these development services, its activities encourage and advance these outcomes.

<u>Primary Business: Exercise leadership in facilitating a shared vision for Minneapolis' future</u>

(Service activities and performance measures sorted by business)

<u>Service Activity:</u> Guide public and private investment and activities in a manner that implements the City's comprehensive plan

Description: The Planning Department partners with and provides support to elected officials, residents, City departments, neighborhood groups, developers and others in order to implement The Minneapolis Plan. This service includes Community Planning, support of CLIC, consulting services on land use and development, and special projects

Key Performance Measures:

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Estimated | 2003 Planned | 2003 Approved |
|--|------------------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| # of presentations of TMP for City departments, elected officials, and neighborhood organizations | 4 | | 4 | 20 | 20 |
| # of community- or citywide initiatives coordinated/assisted | 12-15 | | 10 | 15 | 15 |
| Percent consistent with comp plan | to be measured in 2002 | | | | |
| # of departments and agencies assisted | 14 | | 15 | 20 | 20 |
| # of planning projects assisted by the Planning Department | 25 | | 30 | 35 | 35 |
| % of CLIC members expressing satisfaction with Planning Department staffing | 100% | | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Explanation of Key Performance Measures:

The comp plan work will greatly accelerate in 2002 as well as 2003 due to the Mayor/Council directives to link the plan more closely to city activities and neighborhood plans.

Service Activity: Support the development of a well-designed urban environment

Description: Educate and support on delivery design principals for various projects; Staff coordinates and negotiates with developers, architects, neighborhood groups, business owners, and others to ensure good urban design, pedestrian enhancements, safety, other desirable amenities, and aesthetics. This service activity also includes crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) and supporting the Committee on Urban Environment (CUE).

Key Performance Measures:

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Estimated | 2003 Planned | 2003 Approved |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| # of design review project consultations: | 45 | 25 | 45 | 65 | 65 |
| # of Blooming Boulevard Award applications | 1,144 | 1,955 | 2,000 | 2,200 | 2,200 |
| # of CUE Award applications: | 70 | 70 | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| % of CUE members satisfied with staff support | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| # of CPTED project consultations and training initiatives | 10 | 48 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| % of site plans received for CPTED review | Will first be measured in 2001 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| # of projects given plants & technical advice | N/A | 6 | 12 | 20 | 20 |
| # of participants at public meetings for plan development process | N/A | 40 | 80 | N/A | N/A |

City of Minneapolis – Planning

Explanation of Key Performance Measures:

Educate and support on design principals for projects. The type of design renew projects vary as well as the level of staff involvement. Design guidelines and/or plans require significant staff time and are very detailed. Few are completed each year. Project management also requires significant staff time. This involves monitoring the development and design of a project throughout the approval process (sometimes prior to and after the approval process as well). Design review consultations occur frequently for various projects and are worked into staff schedules.

The magnitude and complexity of projects determines the measured outcomes. These vary.

<u>Service Activity:</u> Provide Research and analysis to guide and support policy development and decision making

Description: This includes research projects, analysis of citywide trends (including census data) airport planning support, State of the City publication, and maintenance of the City's Zoning Map.

Key Performance Measures:

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Estimated | 2003 Planned | 2003 Approved |
|--|--|-------------|--|--------------|---------------|
| # of reports produced | 12 | 10 | 8 | 80 | 80 |
| % of CLIC members expressing satisfaction with Planning Department staff | 95% | 96% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| # of public information (Census 2000) released, distributed and presented to | 35 | 50 | 130 | 150 | 150 |
| # of reports and brochures (Census 2000) produced and distributed | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| # of hits to Minneapolis Census 2000 web site/State of the City web site | N/A | N/A/6,623 | 7,000 (actual 11,475 Jan- May)/N/A | 15,000/N/A | 15,000/N/A |
| # of State of the City produced and distributed | 1,200 produced/1,180 distributed | 1,200 | 1,300 | 1,500 | 1,500 |
| Cost per State of the City report produced | N/A | \$14.16 | \$16.07 | \$17.00 | \$17.00 |
| # of citizen requests responded to neighborhood groups; 300 maps | | | 25 | 30 | 30 |
| # of times participating and leading the discussion on Met Blueprint 2030 (population projections and TAZ) | N/A | N/A | 25 | 10 | 10 |
| # of project reviews for Part 150 Noise Compatibility Program and MAC Capital Improvement | N/A | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| # of times information provided to citizens, neighborhood groups, and policy makers | N/A | 18 | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| Evaluate, develop positions for city on various local & regional airport committees | N/A | N/A | 4 | 8 | 8 |

Explanation of Key Performance Measures:

^{*} Previous SOC reports continue to generate heavy traffic--for example, SOC 99 got 589 hits in December 2000 while SOC 97 got 1,077 hits in the same month.

<u>Service Activity:</u> Provide for the Efficient & Effective Administration of the Planning Department

Description:

Key Performance Measures:

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Estimated | 2003 Planned | 2003 Approved |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| # of employees for which biweekly payroll is provided | 34 | 39.5/5 vacancies | 38.5 FTEs/7 are vacant | 40.5 FTEs* | 40.5 FTEs* |
| Affirmative Action | 34 employees, 3 minorities; 6 disabled; 19 males (18 white; 1 Asian); 15 females (1 Hispanic; 1 Black; 13 White); 30 non-clerical of which 11 were female) | 39.5 employees, 3 minorities; 6 disabled; 19 males (18 white; 1 Asian); 15.5 females (1 Hispanic; 1 Black; 13 White); 30 non- clerical of which 11 were female) | 38.5 employees, 2 minorities; 3 disabled; 16 males (15 white; 1 Asian); 15.5 females (1 Black; 14.5 White); 26.5 non-clerical of which 10 were female) | 40 employees, 5 minorities; 3 disabled; 19 males (18 white; 2 of color); 15.5 females (2 if color; 13 White); 32 non- clerical of which 12 were female) | 40 employees, 5 minorities; 3 disabled; 19 males (18 white; 2 of color); 15.5 females (2 if color; 13 White); 32 non-clerical of which 12 were female) |
| OSHA | Annual OSHA 200 Reports (2000 = 2) | Annual OSHA 200 Reports (2001 = 0) | Annual OSHA 200 Reports (2002 = 0) | Annual OSHA 200 Reports (2003 = 0) | Annual OSHA 200 Reports (2003 = 0) |
| ADA | : Develop & maintain ADA standards providing material to blind and sign language interpreters to improve integration of services | Maintain ADA standards providing material to blind and sign language interpreters to improve integration of services | Maintain ADA standards providing material to blind and sign language interpreters to improve integration of services | Maintain ADA standards providing material to blind and sign language interpreters to improve integration of services | Maintain ADA standards providing material to blind and sign language interpreters to improve integration of services |
| Safety | Safety checks and reports begun and completed in timely manner; annual emergency evacuation drills; monthly safety publication reviews; periodic CCP Safe presentations to staff | Safety checks and reports begun and completed in timely manner; annual emergency evacuation drills; periodic CCP Safe presentations to staff; visitors check in at reception & escorted; IDs worn | Safety checks and reports begun and completed in timely manner; annual emergency evacuation drills; periodic CCP Safe presentations to staff; visitors check in at reception & escorted; IDs worn | Safety checks and reports begun and completed in timely manner; annual emergency evacuation drills; periodic CCP Safe presentations to staff; visitors check in at reception & escorted; IDs worn | Safety checks and reports begun and completed in timely manner; annual emergency evacuation drills; periodic CCP Safe presentations to staff; visitors check in at reception & escorted; IDs worn |
| Training | Conference/Semin ars attendance; publications | Conference/Semin ars attendance; publications | Conference/Semin ars attendance; publications | Conference/Semin ars attendance; publications | Conference/Semi nars attendance; publications |

Explanation of Key Performance Measures:

Service Activity: Provide professional graphic & publication services.

Description:

Key Performance Measures:

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Estimated | 2003 Planned | 2003 Approved |
|--|--|--|---|--------------|---------------|
| # of work orders processed | 458 | 580 | 570 | | |
| % of work orders originating from City Planning Department | 50% | 554 | 550 | | |
| Timeliness | Response time met, and sometimes exceeded expectations of customers | Response time met, and sometimes exceeded expectations of customers | Response time met, and sometimes exceeded expectations of customers | | |

Explanation of Key Performance Measures:

^{* 2003} includes the additional of Cultural Affairs to the Planning Department (2.0 FTEs) - 1 male; 1 female

Service Activity: Coordinate development of citywide public art policy recommendations

Description: Staff coordinate the development of arts policy recommendations with broad-based input from stakeholders and community members. Public arts staff oversees the inventory, development, conservation, and maintenance of public art projects. The Film/Video Coordinator coordinates film & video permits. Staff also administers the 2003 multicultural arts festivals and visual arts installations in City Hall.

Key Performance Measures:

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Estimated | 2003 Planned | 2003 Approved |
|---|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Pilot 4 projects which integrate public art into city infrastructure develop: # of dollars leveraged for support from other depts/partners/# of city staff engaged in process/# of artists selected for | N/A | N/A | \$100,000/50/6 | | |
| Engage community in dev of public art projects: # neighborhood gateway projects completed/# community mtgs. held gathering input/# of community-based steering committee developed to coord projects | N/A | N/A | 3/4/1 | | |
| Maintain & conserve city- owned artwork: # of artwork;# of improved maint;# artwork assessed for maint needs/# prtnships dev w/city boards & depts | N/A | N/A | 10/25/35/3 | | |
| Maintain inventory city- owned artwork: # of artwork; # of new artwork to FISCOL; # artwork receiving location codes | N/A | N/A | 75/60/75 | | |
| Coordinate permits for variety of film, video & media productions: # productions; \$ oprtng budgets; # locations assistance | N/A | 206/\$6.2 million/200 | 225/\$6.2 million/205 | 240/\$6.3 million/210 | 240/\$6.3 million/210 |
| Develop & Admin Steering Committee for Multicultural Arts Festival:# com prtners; # neighborhoods served; # artists/performances | N/A | N/A | N/A | 20/81/tbd | 20/81/tbd |
| Foster & promote visual arts installs in municipal bldgs: # art in Mayor's; # city/cty art show; # city-owned artwork | N/A | 6/tbd in 2003/152 | 6/tbd in 2003/134 | 6/tbd in 2003/tbd in 2003 | 6/tbd in 2003/tbd in 2003 |
| Develop internal exhibition policy w/ MBC | N/A | N/A | N/A | TBD in 2003 | TBD in 2003 |

Explanation of Key Performance Measures: No data available for 2000.

<u>Primary Business: Ensure compatibility with approved City's comprehensive plan, zoning code, land subdivision, and heritage preservation regulations and guidelines.</u>

(Service activities and performance measures sorted by business)

<u>Service Activity:</u> Provide analysis & recommendation on land use & development issues to CPC, Z&P, and Board of Adjustment

Description: Provide professional analysis & recommendation, prepare report & presentation for public hearing in 30 days, and review & comment on consistency of reviews with the City's comprehensive plan.

Key Performance Measures:

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Estimated | 2003 Planned | 2003 Approved |
|--|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| | | | | | |
| # reviews/development services staff | 765 | 801 | 800* | 950 | 950 |
| # reviews submitted - complete/incomplete | | | 44/53* | | |
| | | | | | |
| Board of Adjustment-# of items appealed | | | 4 | | |
| Board of Adjustment-# of items recommendation followed | | | 33 | | |
| Board of Adjustments - Items complete/incomplete** | | | 35/15 | | |

Explanation of Key Performance Measures:

<u>Service Activity:</u> Conduct mandatory review of capital improvements, redevelopment activities, and land disposition

Description:

Key Performance Measures:

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Estimated | 2003 Planned | 2003 Approved |
|---|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| # of mandatory reviews conducted * | 45 | | | | |
| % of Planning Dept. recommendations that are followed | 99% | | | | |
| % of reviews consistent with the comprehensive plan | 100% | | | | |
| # of location & design review | 93 | 83 | 115 | 100 | 100 |

Explanation of Key Performance Measures:

^{*55%} of these items were incomplete which caused delay for scheduling before the Commission; there were 15 applications in which the Planning Commission did not follow staff recommendations; 85% of staff recommendations were followed; there were 8 appeals of Planning Commission decisions; 8% of applications were appealed.

^{**30%} of the items of the Board of Adjustment were incomplete which caused delay for scheduling before the Board; there were 17 applications in which the Board did not follow staff recommendations; 67% of staff recommendations were followed; there were 4 appeals of Board decisions; 8% of applications were appealed.

^{*} These include development districts; redevelopment plans, TIF plans; location & design reviews; public land sales; Tax-Based Revitalization applications; bond sales, Livable Communities applications

Location and design reviews entail compiling all projects capitally funded; reviewing these projects to determine projects that can be waived and those requiring additional renewal; analyzing the review projects for compliance with the Minneapolis Plan, preparing a staff report and presenting to the Planning Commission. This process begins n January and MUST be completed by the end of April for bond sale.

<u>Service Activity:</u> Promote the recognition, preservation and reuse of landmarks, properties in historic districts and other historic resources

Description: Includes, identification of historic resources; designation of historic landmarks & historic districts; review of applications for required approvals; implementation of new heritage preservation regulations; participation in required Section 106 Review(s), and Education and outreach.

Key Performance Measures:

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Estimated | 2003 Planned | 2003 Approved |
|--|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Regulatory Activities- Historic Designations | 3* | 2** | 1 | | |
| Regulatory Activities-#demo reviews to determine if any historic resource | 375 | 125 | 150 | | |
| Regulatory Activities-# apps reviewed for major alterations | 74 | 86 | 60*** | | |
| Regulatory Activities-# apps reviewed for historic variances | 0 | 1 | 4 | | |
| Regulatory Activities-# of pre-permit discussions | 12 | 12 | 12 | | |
| Regulatory Activities-# of CNCs issued for minor alterations | 131 | 124 | 125 | | |
| Regulatory Activities-# National Register nominations reviewed | 6 | 2 | 2 | | |
| Education/Outreach Activities-# walking tours/total attendance | 10/178 | 26/393 | 22/350 | | |
| Education/Outreach Activities-Lectures/other preservation week activities/Preservation Awards Luncheon | 5/1 | 5/1 | 1/1 | | |

Explanation of Key Performance Measures:

- * Band Box, Montefiore Chapel and Cemetery, Shoreham Yards Roundhouse in 2000
- ** MacPhail School of Music and Harmon Place Historic District
- *** Decrease in the number of applications reflects revised approval process put in place after the adoption of the new HPC ordinance in 2001. One application can now cover what were previously multiple applications.

Other Activities:

Work on numerous Federal Section 106 reviews, average 7-10 new reviews per year.

Complete two historic context studies in 2000.

Adopt design guidelines for the Band Box and Montefiore Cemetery in 2000.

Prepare and adopt new preservation ordinance in 2000-2001.

Survey 8,000 plus buildings to identify historic resources in 2001.

Worked with other city agencies to complete the mills District Master Plan Update in 2001.

Complete adoption of new HPC Bylaws in 2002.

Survey 8,000-10,000 buildings to identify historic resources in 2002.

Adopt design guidelines for the Harmon Place Historic District and MacPhail School of Music in 2002.

Financial Analysis:

For the 2003 General Fund budget, the Planning Department proposed, the Mayor recommended, and the Council adopted two target strategies: a reduction of \$41,000 achievable by cutting a part-time (0.5 FTE) Planner III position; and a reduction of \$59,000 achievable by cutting the vacant Community Crime Prevention Coordinator position (1.0 FTE). Additionally, for a savings of \$38,000, the Mayor has recommended Planning change its hard-copy publication of "State of the City" and transfer publication design to the Communications Department for a web-based strategy.

City of Minneapolis – Planning 2003 Adopted Budget

Included in Planning's budget for 2003 is the transfer of the Zoning division from the Inspections' Department (as Council directed for 2002, "the position, duties and authority of the Zoning Administrator be transferred from the Director of the Inspection Division to the Planning Director"). With the transfer of Zoning, 8.0 Zoning personnel (FTEs) and related expenses, for a total of \$548,000 plus a revenue budget of \$284,000 for Zoning ordinance fees was moved to Planning. For 2003, the Planning Department has estimated that it will contribute other revenue of \$20,000 to the General Fund generated through operations, including development services for sub-divisions and plats. The Special Revenue Funds (Federal, State, and local grants) have been reduced for 2003 as the State Light Rail Transit Grant (LRT) for \$130,000 ended in 2002.

On the expense side, the Department's 2003 budget of \$3.7 million includes 60% General Fund and 40% CDBG (Community Development Block Grant). As part of the adopted budget, the Council modified Planning's funding-source balance by "increasing Planning in the CDBG fund by \$167,000 and decreasing Planning in the General Fund by a like amount". Excluding this funding shift, for 2003, the General Fund expense budget increased by 8.8% for recent personnel upgrades, job reclassifications, and \$75,000 from moving the Office of Cultural Affairs personnel (1.0 FTE) to Planning from the Coordinator Department during 2002. In addition to the level of budgeted personnel shown on the Staffing Information schedule, the Public Arts Administrator position, transferred from the former Office of Cultural Affairs, is funded from the Capital Fund. Additionally for 2003, \$20,000 in Special Revenue Funds, associated with Office of Cultural Affairs' activity, moved to Planning from the Coordinator's Department. The difference between revenue and expense in the Special Revenue Funds is the amount of the CDBG appropriation, which is recognized as revenue at the City level.

Summary of Target Strategies:

Title: City Planner III

Fund # 0100 Agency # 380 Organization # 3820

FundCostRevenuesFTE'sJob Titles/Other related costs0100(\$41,324)\$0.00(0.5)City Planner III

Mayor's Recommendation:

The Mayor recommends this strategy

Council Adopted:

The Council concurs with this recommendation

Expense: (\$41,000) Revenue:

Proposal Description: If 2% is the department reduction amount, this .5 FTE City Planner III would be cut. This is a position that is currently filled.

Describe how the proposal impacts your service activities and performance measures: The primary duties of this position were related to The Minneapolis Plan and neighborhood profiles. This work will have to be distributed to one or more other positions.

Title: Community Crime Prevention Coordinator (CPTED)

Fund # 0100 Agency # 380 Organization # 3820

FundCostRevenuesFTE'sJob Titles/Other related costs0100(\$58,778)\$0.00(1.0)Community Crime Prevent Coordinator

Mayor's Recommendation:

The Mayor recommends this strategy

Council Adopted:

The Council concurs with this recommendation

Expense: (\$59,000) Revenue:

Proposal Description: If 4% is the department reduction amount, this 1.0 FTE Community Crime Prevention Coordinator would be cut.

Describe how the proposal impacts your service activities and performance measures: The duties of this position will have to be distributed among a couple other City Planners.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT Expense Information

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Adopted Budget | 2003 Adopted Budget | % Change 2002 to 2003 | Change 2002 to 2003 |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| General Fund - City | | | | | | |
| Capital Outlay | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,020 | 2.0% | 20 |
| Contractual Services | 275,981 | 231,377 | 73,650 | 92,649 | 25.8% | 18,999 |
| Equipment | 36,531 | 29,466 | 1,700 | 3,734 | 119.6% | 2,034 |
| Fringe Benefits | 198,072 | 218,733 | 291,376 | 381,802 | 31.0% | 90,426 |
| Operating Costs | 102,528 | 118,476 | 68,593 | 91,945 | 34.0% | 23,352 |
| Salaries and Wages | 957,921 | 1,076,155 | 1,239,233 | 1,632,822 | 31.8% | 393,589 |
| Total for General Fund - City | 1,571,032 | 1,674,208 | 1,675,552 | 2,203,972 | 31.5% | 528,420 |
| Special Revenue Funds | | | | | | |
| Contractual Services | 225,118 | 338,755 | 82,657 | 303,191 | 266.8% | 220,534 |
| Equipment | 7,430 | 0 | 1,300 | 1,326 | 2.0% | 26 |
| Fringe Benefits | 176,153 | 158,322 | 193,221 | 245,688 | 27.2% | 52,467 |
| Operating Costs | 3,819 | 678 | 9,250 | 9,435 | 2.0% | 185 |
| Salaries and Wages | 789,874 | 801,407 | 831,572 | 948,340 | 14.0% | 116,768 |
| Total for Special Revenue Funds | 1,202,395 | 1,299,163 | 1,118,000 | 1,507,980 | 34.9% | 389,980 |
| Total for PLANNING DEPARTMENT | 2,773,428 | 2,973,371 | 2,793,552 | 3,711,952 | 32.9% | 918,400 |

PLANNING DEPARTMENT Revenue Information

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Adopted Budget | 2003 Adopted Budget | % Change 2002 to 2003 | Change 2002 to 2003 |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| General Fund - City | | | | | | |
| Charges for Sales | 7,479 | 2,660 | 4,000 | 0 | -100.0% | -4,000 |
| Charges for Service | 15,780 | 19,024 | 17,000 | 304,118 | 1,688.9% | 287,118 |
| Operating Transfers In | 29,500 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 |
| Other Misc Revenues | 16,048 | 9,139 | 5,000 | 0 | -100.0% | -5,000 |
| Total for General Fund - City | 68,806 | 30,823 | 26,000 | 304,118 | 1,069.7% | 278,118 |
| Special Revenue Funds | | | | | | |
| Contributions | 0 | 3,979 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 |
| Federal Government | 9,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 0.0% | 0 |
| Local Government | 0 | 60,000 | 0 | 20,000 | 0.0% | 20,000 |
| Operating Transfers In | 119,775 | 139,860 | 185,000 | 185,000 | 0.0% | 0 |
| State Government | 26,684 | 103,999 | 130,000 | 0 | -100.0% | -130,000 |
| Total for Special Revenue Funds | 155,458 | 327,839 | 335,000 | 225,000 | -32.8% | -110,000 |
| Total for PLANNING DEPARTMENT | 224,265 | 358,662 | 361,000 | 529,118 | 46.6% | 168,118 |

PLANNING DEPARTMENT Business Line Expense Information

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Adopted Budget | 2003 Adopted Budget | % Change 2002 to 2003 | Change 2002 to 2003 |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| ADMIN & SUPPORT SERVICES | | | | | | |
| General Fund - City | | | | | | |
| Contractual Services | 21,178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 |
| Fringe Benefits | 36,243 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 |
| Operating Costs | 20,853 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 |
| Salaries and Wages | 165,220 | -23,334 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 |
| Total for General Fund - City | 243,494 | -23,334 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Special Revenue Funds | | | | | | |
| Fringe Benefits | 17,087 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 |
| Salaries and Wages | 72,738 | 23,334 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 |
| Total for Special Revenue Funds | 89,825 | 23,334 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| - | | | | | | |
| Total for ADMIN & SUPPORT SERVICES | 333,319 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| GRAPHICS | | | | | | |
| General Fund - City | | | | | | |
| Contractual Services | 399 | 115 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 |
| Equipment | 0 | 579 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Fringe Benefits | 24,237 | 23,658 | 48,136 | 31,109 | | -17,027 |
| Operating Costs | 1,745 | 976 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Salaries and Wages | 109,125 | 111,730 | 213,378 | 125,950 | -41.0% | -87,428 |
| Total for General Fund - City | 135,505 | 137,060 | 261,514 | 157,059 | -39.9% | -104,455 |
| Special Revenue Funds | | | | | | |
| Fringe Benefits | 19,908 | 20,453 | 0 | 22,078 | 0.0% | 22,078 |
| Salaries and Wages | 90,904 | 95,048 | 0 | 94,298 | 0.0% | 94,298 |
| Total for Special Revenue Funds | 110,812 | 115,501 | 0 | 116,376 | | 116,376 |
| Total for GRAPHICS | 246,317 | 252,560 | 261,514 | 273,435 | 4.6% | 11,921 |
| PLANNING | | | | | | |
| General Fund - City | | | | | | |
| Capital Outlay | 0 | 0 | 1,000 | 1,020 | 2.0% | 20 |
| Contractual Services | 254,404 | 231,262 | 73,650 | 54,464 | -26.1% | -19,186 |
| Equipment | 36,531 | 28,886 | 1,700 | 1,734 | 2.0% | 34 |
| Fringe Benefits | 137,592 | 195,075 | 243,240 | 260,176 | 7.0% | 16,936 |
| Operating Costs | 79,930 | 117,500 | 68,593 | 70,536 | 2.8% | 1,943 |
| Salaries and Wages | 683,576 | 987,759 | 1,025,855 | 1,110,942 | 8.3% | 85,087 |
| Total for General Fund - City | 1,192,033 | 1,560,482 | 1,414,038 | 1,498,872 | 6.0% | 84,834 |
| Special Revenue Funds | | | | | | |
| Contractual Services | 225,118 | 338,755 | 82,657 | 303,191 | 266.8% | 220,534 |
| Equipment | 7,430 | 0 | 1,300 | 1,326 | 2.0% | 26 |
| Fringe Benefits | 139,158 | 137,869 | 193,221 | 223,610 | 15.7% | 30,389 |
| Operating Costs | 3,819 | 678 | 9,250 | 9,435 | 2.0% | 185 |

PLANNING DEPARTMENT Business Line Expense Information

| | 2000 Actual | 2001 Actual | 2002 Adopted Budget | 2003 Adopted Budget | % Change 2002 to 2003 | Change 2002 to 2003 |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| PLANNING | | | | | | |
| Special Revenue Funds | | | | | | |
| Salaries and Wages | 626,233 | 683,026 | 831,572 | 854,042 | 2.7% | 22,470 |
| Total for Special Revenue Funds | 1,001,758 | 1,160,328 | 1,118,000 | 1,391,604 | 24.5% | 273,604 |
| Total for PLANNING | 2,193,791 | 2,720,810 | 2,532,038 | 2,890,476 | 14.2% | 358,438 |
| ZONING | | | | | | |
| General Fund - City | | | | | | |
| Contractual Services | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38,185 | 0.0% | 38,185 |
| Equipment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,000 | 0.0% | 2,000 |
| Fringe Benefits | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90,517 | 0.0% | 90,517 |
| Operating Costs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21,409 | 0.0% | 21,409 |
| Salaries and Wages | 0 | 0 | 0 | 395,930 | 0.0% | 395,930 |
| Total for General Fund - City | 0 | 0 | 0 | 548,041 | | 548,041 |
| Total for ZONING | 0 | 0 | 0 | 548,041 | | 548,041 |
| Total for PLANNING DEPARTMENT | 2,773,428 | 2,973,371 | 2,793,552 | 3,711,952 | 32.9% | 918,400 |

PLANNING DEPARTMENT Staffing Information

| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 Adopted Budget | 2003 Adopted Budget | % Change 2002 to 2003 | Change 2002 to 2003 |
|-------------------|-------|-------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| FTE's by Division | | | | | | |
| Planning | 35.00 | 35.50 | 34.50 | 34.00 | -1.45% | (0.50) |
| Graphics | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 4.00 | 0.00% | - |
| Zoning | - | - | - | 8.00 | - | 8.00 |
| Total FTE's | 39.00 | 39.50 | 38.50 | 46.00 | 19.48% | 7.50 |